

REMARKS

Claims 1-5 are pending. Applicant respectfully submits no new material is presented herein.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102 and §103

Claims 1 and 3-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Number 6,490,363 to Liu. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

Claim 1 recites a speaker apparatus including a dome diaphragm equipped with a voice coil and having a concave cross section protruding towards the voice coil; an edge provided on the outer periphery of the dome diaphragm, having a concave cross section protruding towards the voice coil, and supporting the dome diaphragm on a frame; and a magnetic circuit forming a magnetic gap containing the voice coil, wherein the edge has an edge width bearing a lower playback frequency band than a playback frequency band born by the dome diaphragm.

According to the claimed invention, the width of the edge is formed to be relatively large. In this way, the edge has a low frequency band playback characteristic while the dome diaphragm is allowed to have a large amplitude so that it is possible to perform a satisfactorily low frequency band playback. As a result, together with a satisfactorily high frequency band playback characteristic of the dome diaphragm, it is possible to ensure a relatively broad playback frequency band. Furthermore, speakers having such a structural configuration exhibit relatively good directivity as inverted dome speakers. Therefore, it is possible to provide an improved or better speaker apparatus that maintains the advantages of inverted dome speakers, including good directivity and

relatively thin body profile while also providing a relatively broad playback frequency band extending from a high frequency band to a low frequency band.

Applicant respectfully submits Liu fails to disclose or suggest each and every feature recited by the claimed invention.

In particular, Applicant notes Liu discloses an inverted dome speaker having a pair of upper and lower edges 11 and 12, respectively, which provide a balancing effect and thus prevent any eccentricity during the driving of the speaker, thereby compensating for any insufficient tensile forces during a reverse vibration, thereby providing improved sound quality. However, Liu fails to disclose or suggest either one of the upper and lower edge 11 and 12, respectively, having an edge width bearing a lower playback frequency band than a playback frequency band born by the dome diaphragm. Further, Applicant respectfully submits that Liu fails to disclose or suggest that either one of the edges 11 or 12, or even another edge be provided to release sound in addition to the sound releasing function of the dome diaphragm 26.

To qualify as prior art, each feature of a rejected claim must be taught or suggested by the applied art of record. Furthermore, to establish *prima facie* obviousness of a rejected claim, each and every feature of the rejected claim must be taught or suggested by the applied art of record. As explained above, Liu fails to disclose or suggest each and every feature recited by Claim 1. Therefore, Claim 1 is not anticipated by or rendered obvious in view of the teachings of Liu.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 1 should be deemed allowable over Liu.

Claims 2-5 depend from Claim 1.

It is respectfully submitted that these dependent claims be deemed allowable for at least the same reasons Claim 1 is allowable, as well as for the additional subject matter recited therein.

Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

English Translation

As noted by the Examiner in item 5 of the Office Action, JP 54-1242 was not considered since an English translation of the foreign reference was not provided in the Information Disclosure Statement filed February 25, 2004. As requested by the Examiner, a partial English translation of the relevant portion of JP 54-1242 is enclosed herein so that the Examiner may properly consider the reference. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner consider the reference and provide a copy of Form PTO-1449 with the Examiner's initials next to the cited reference indicating the Examiner properly considered the reference. A copy of the PTO Form 1449 is attached for the Examiner's convenience.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration of the application, withdrawal of the outstanding rejections, allowance of Claims 1-5, and the prompt issuance of a Notice of Allowability are respectfully solicited.

Should the Examiner believe anything further is desirable in order to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

In the event that the filing of this paper is not deemed timely, Applicant petitions for an appropriate extension of time. Any petition fee for the extension of time and any other fees that may be required in relation to this paper can be charged to Deposit Account No. 01-2300, **referencing Docket No. 107156-00230.**

Respectfully submitted,



Murat Ozgu
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 44,275

Customer No. 004372

ARENT FOX PLLC
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.,
Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20036-5339
Tel: (202) 857-6000
Fax: (202) 638-4810

GEO/MO:elp

Enclosures: English Translation of JP54-1242
PTO 1449